



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/622,544	10/13/2000	Sarkis Barret Kalindjian	40283/183	8561

7590

04/30/2002

Bernhard D Saxe
Foley & Lardner
Washington Harbour Suite 500
3000 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

KIFLE, BRUCK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 04/30/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/622,544

Applicant(s)
Kalindjian et al.

Examiner
Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.

Art Unit
1624



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 19, 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 8, 9, and 12-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 8, 9, and 12-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1624

Applicant's amendments and remarks filed 2/19/02 have been received and reviewed.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9 and 12-29 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9 and 12-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- i) Applicants are advised to replace "W" with N in claim 1 as "W" is no longer present in the structural formula of amended claim 1. Similarly, A, B and X are also no longer present in the structure. Appropriate corrections of the definitions of R³ and Y is required.
- ii) The definition of R⁵, R⁶ and R⁷ as "C₁ to C₁₀ hydrocarbyl, in which up to 3 carbon atoms may be replaced by O or N, and up to 3 hydrogen atoms may be replaced by halogen" is indefinite. One cannot say for sure what is included and what is not within the scope of this group. The term is self contradictory because a hydrocarbyl cannot have a heteroatom present. It is unclear where a heteroatom is permitted and where it is not. One cannot say whether a ring is intended or not.
- iii) Claims 9 and 10 lack antecedent basis in claim 1. Note, m and n are no longer present in claim 1.
- iv) In claim 12 one cannot say what compound looks like.
- v) In claim 28 it is unclear which patient needs modifying H₃ receptor activity. One skilled in the art cannot say who is in need thereof and who is not. Nor can one say what is accomplished.

Art Unit: 1624

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. A proviso has been included in claim 1 that reads “provided that Y is C₅ to C₁₀ alkylene when Z is -N(R⁵)S(O)₂-”. This proviso lacks description. Even negative limitations require a description. The MPEP at 2173.05(i) Negative Limitations states “Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. See *Ex parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983) *aff’d* mem., 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984)” and, further, “Any claim containing a negative limitation which does not have basis in the original disclosure should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement.” In the instant case, the new concept that has been introduced by the proviso is the specific relationships between the variables Y and Z. This specific relationship of connectivity was previously not disclosed. This notion that the definition of one variable depends on the definitions of other variables is new. The definition of a variable is no longer independent.

Claims 14-28 are of a different scope and have been examined only to the extent of the scope of claim 1.

Art Unit: 1624

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jozic (US 4,372,955). The reference teaches structurally similar compounds that differ from the claimed compounds by the length of the linking carbon chain at Y (see cols. 9-10, compound number 5 and col. 11, compound No. 18). The claims have an added proviso that requires Y to be at least a C₅ alkylene over the C₃ alkylene of compounds 5 and 18 of the reference.

It has been long established that structural relationship varying the size of a linking carbon chain - is per se obvious. Specifically, Ex parte Ruddy 121 USPQ 427 has a C₃ link unpatentable over a C₁ link. Ex parte Nathan, 121 USPQ 349 found the insertion of a C₂H₄ link obvious. In all of these cases, the variation was per-se obvious and did not require a specific teaching.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


Art Unit: 1624

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruck Kifle whose telephone number is (703) 305-4484.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4556 or (703) 305-3592. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

April 26, 2002


Bruck Kifle
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624